OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.				IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED?	YES ☐ NO ☒
ED 039 383				ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE?	YES ☐ NO ☒
CH ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE	LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY	I ☒ II ☐ III ☐
AA 000 561		Apr 70	RIEOCT70		

AUTHOR

TITLE

Special Class Placement - A Continuing Debate. Papers Presented at the Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (48th, Chicago, Illinois, April 19-25, 1970).

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
FGK19725	Council for Exceptional Children, Arlington, Virginia
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25;1.80		
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO.
-		

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE

34p.

DESCRIPTORS

*Exceptional Child Education; *Handicapped Children; *Mentally Handicapped; *Placement; Regular Class Placement; Special Classes; Educable Mentally Handicapped; Educational Trends; Educational Needs; Conference Reports

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

The report of the proceedings of the 1970 convention of the Council for Exceptional Children includes papers on the arguments for and against special class placement. Discussions concern themselves with love of life, truth, and others by Matt Trippe, the efficacy of special placement for educable mentally handicapped children by John W. Kidd, and the destructiveness of special placement by Tony C. Milazzo. Additional speeches describe the efficacy of special placement for the educable mentally handicapped by Roger Reger and the prospects of the mentally handicapped for the future by Donald F. Sellin. (JM)

GPO 870-390

ED 039 383

Special Class Placement - A Continuing Debate

Papers Presented at the

48th Annual International Convention

The Council for Exceptional Children

Chicago, Illinois

April 19-25, 1970

Compiled by

The Council for Exceptional Children

Jefferson Plaza Suite 900

1411 South Jefferson Davis Highway

Arlington, Virginia 22202

AA 000 561

Table of Contents

	Page
Love of Life, Love of Truth, Love of Others Matt Trippe	1
Pro - The Efficacy of Special Class Placement for Educable Mental Retardates John W. Kidd	4
Special Class Placement or How to Destroy in the Name of Help Tony C. Milazzo	9
The Efficacy of Special Class Placement for Educable Mental Retardates Roger Reger	15
Mental Retardation 1984: Will the Paradox End? Donald F. Sellin	20

LOVE OF LIFE, LOVE OF TRUTH, LOVE OF OTHERS

Matt Trippe
The University of Michigan

The single, most important concern that binds us together in professional association and fellowship is the responsibility we share for helping behaviorally deviant children. These children, whether or not their learning of formal materials is in keeping with the expectations of the schools (and for most, it is not), all exceed the limits of acceptable behavior set by the schools. We have come through an era, content to take the standards of the schools as given and have worked under rules, regulations and delivery systems that place the responsibility for failures of fit between pupils and schools on the student or the variety of gremlins which he hosts. We have worked hard to exorcise these gremlins and had cause to feel good about ourselves and the social value of our dedication and work. We now stand on the threshold of a new era symbolized by our presence here in beautiful, downtown Gary and characterized by Pogo's incisive observation - We have met the enemy and it is us! Where we go from Gary, I know, is a matter of deep concern and anguish for us all.

Man chooses the problems he is willing to live with as much as he chooses the goals he seeks to attain. Every solution has within it its own problems and our professional lives are presently captive of inescapable consequences of conditions which exist in school and society today. These circumstances of school and life include:

The failure of schools to serve responsibly in excess of 25% of the children delivered to it for present and future benefit
The heartless bureaucracy of too many schools, the depersonalization and inhumanity of too many teachers and the delusions of helpfulness of too many special educators
The critical crises in mental health of our young particularly but of all ages really from early childhood through senior citizenry
Dropouts, pushouts, the unemployed, and the underemployed
An adult electorate that is anti-intellectual and doesn't read
Social crises of violence, crime, drugs and racism
Social stratification (in what is tauted as an open, democratic society) based on intellectual facism and promoted by schools through their pursuit of excellence to the exclusion of competence.

These are some of the problems that stem largely from school practices that give lip service to the education of the whole child while personnel and resources are mobilized to promote scholarship and excellence in a few to the exclusion of concern for broadly based competence among the many. The U. S. Commissioner of Education last September proposed the right to read as fundamental as the right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. He announced that the achievement of this goal is education's moonshot for the seventies. By the end of the present decade, no one should be leaving our schools without the skill and the desire necessary to read to the full limits of his capability. He was aware of the problems that stem from education's solutions when he observed that education has been a failure for the difficult more than 25% and that they stand as a reproach to all of us who hold in our hands the shaping of the opportunity for education. We all certainly share his concern but his solution is another matter. THE RIGHT TO READ - TARGET FOR THE 70'S borrows its punch from the space program without cautioning that the success of NASA as well as the panic in educational circles created by the launching of Sputnik were both based on a commitment to develop excellence. After all, how many astronauts do we need? The Right to Read however is a program for universal competence. To move on it with manned space tactics is to doom it to failure as surely as compensatory and remedial programs have already failed. Reading, we know is an essentially human activity as much as it is a specific skill. School practices which utilize needless competition and establish arbitrary standards that produce failures which then require remedial efforts are a much greater problem than the lack of specific skill on the part of the teacher in reading instruction. Love too is an essentially human endeavor as we all know, but few of us would hold much hope for its promotion through sex manuals.

To be fully alive, one must feel good about himself, solve problems rationally and be compassionate of others. If schools were fiercely dedicated to fostering joy, rational inquiry and human understanding, the present distinction between special education and the mainstream would dissolve. Schools however only acknowledge developing the mind as their real responsibility regardless of the rhetoric in charters and journals. If they were more forthright, the situation would not be as bad. If they were to say that they care only about the head and can do nothing for the heart or the soul, then we'd have to deal with it. But to accept the challenge on the one hand and deny it on the other serves only to generate false complacency. Time is running out and we remain complacent at our peril. Concern for the head and failure to nourish the heart and the soul is a solution whose price we cannot afford. Joy and compassion are as necessary in humans as is reason. Advances in technology may come about largely through the exercise of reason but the use to which these advances are put - either for the benefit of mankind or for its destruction - are determined largely by the feelings we have about ourselves and our feelings about others. Feeling and doing are as important as thinking and remembering although what one observes in schools would suggest otherwise. The body and the spirit are as much to be celebrated as the mind. With the decline in influence of the church and the home, efforts in these areas by the schools are vital to our survival.

While medicine attempts cures of the ills of the body and the self to restore them to normality, the human potential movement tries to turn man on to the heights of creativity and fulfillment. Pupils at increasingly younger ages are showing through protest and unrest their responses to arbitrary controls and demands exercised by the schools. Sadly, even the most able students are alienated and in many quarters the search goes on for alternatives to education. Choice has become possible with the development of free or open schools across the land. Through social welfare, we atone

for mans initial inhumanity. This initial inhumanity in the circumstances of our lives is prompting many to drop out and seek fulfillment in isolation or communal societies.

Clearly, the schooling we need is not to learn our place in society nor to bow down to the demands of the technology and superstate. Rather, we need

1. to discover joy through a variety of experiences that produce mastery and self discovery
2. to discover truth, reason and rational problem solving from the interrelatedness of knowledge and the integrated curriculum
3. to discover compassion through cooperative, helpful experiences with others that reduce our fears and broaden our understandings.

Love of life, pursuit of truth and human compassion demand that we each in our own way be adamant in our refusal to participate in the further destruction of children. We must work for the elimination of social and educational practices which promote the welfare of some to the detriment and harm of others. Thus will we advance on the Commissioner's TARGET FOR THE 70'S - The right to read, the right to life, the right to love!

To be fully alive and human, one must	Love Life	Love Truth	Love Others
These have been located in	The Heart	The Head	The Soul
They function through	The Body	The Mind	The Spirit
The attribute is	Joy	Reason	Compassion
They have been promoted by	The Home	The School	The Church
Formal agencies responsible for each	Medicine	Education	Social Welfare
Informal socializing influences for positive resolution	Human Potential Movement	Open Schools	Communes
The education we need to foster its development	Experiences Leading to Self-mastery	Integrated Curriculum	Cooperative Learning from Each Other

Pro - The Efficacy of Special Class Placement for Educable Mental Retardates

John W. Kidd, Ed.D.
Special School District of St. Louis County
St. Louis, Missouri

We make the following assumptions:

1. The e.m.r. efficacy studies and reports are familiar to this audience. (Parenthetically; if they are not, suffice it to summarize them as showing no consistent support for special class as opposed to regular class placement for the educable mentally retarded --- findings are based on tests of academic achievement and social adjustment.)
2. Neither pro nor con speakers are to lose sight of the target and shoot, instead at a) terminology and classification --- perhaps we could agree that many children now labelled m.r. should not be so labelled --- that "general learning disability --- remediable" would be more precisely descriptive of many "track A - educables" who come to us essentially organically intact --- the victims of cognitive and affective deprivation and often deprived of an environment conducive to physical health and pre-natal age --- nor will the other speakers shoot at b) the question, "What really is mental retardation?" I hear high officials say, "He's not <u>really</u> retarded", about an IQ 70 or 65 child, meaning that his retardation is not of genetic or organic etiology --- well, of course, we know some 75%-90% of mental retardation is not of organic or genetic etiology; nor will they shoot at c) any one form of, or location of, or staffing of the special class for e.m.r.'s but <u>at our topic</u> --- nor will they shoot at d) the kinds of special classes they have known or operated as though they were

the only possibilities.

It is my intention to report on some outstandingly successful special classes --- to invite you to visit them --- to suggest how others may enjoy such success --- and to point up our rationale here today.

If football teams in school more successfully learn football due to the homogeneous selection of players ---

if the debate team, the glee club or choir, the band, each consists of and should consist of members peculiarly strong in those traits nourished by that activity;

if moving from a one-room, one-teacher school with children ages 6 to 12 to a one-grade arrangement of children age six is progress, and, who is to deny that it is?

if we homogeneously group pupils so as to enhance their educability by keeping the cripples off the track team ---

if teachers are more effective the more homogeneous their class members, i.e., if teachers can teach children of a narrow age range or ability range better than a random sample of children - and they can; --- if most teachers can teach one or a few subjects better than just any or all subjects --- and they can;

if children learn in relation to what happens in class - and they do;

then it is logically absurd to group children and assign teachers for instruction and learning without regard to ability or achievement levels.

If homogeneity of pupils is unrelated to instruction and learning, then we would be grouping children by criteria other than ability and achievement as we are doing throughout education from nursery school to graduate school.

Now --- to select a single slice of the continuum of human ability and contend that it should not have the advantage of homogeneous grouping for education --- as the "con"

position must contend if they stick to the subject --- is contrary to all reason unless they contend that no grouping for educational purposes should be related to ability levels --- they can scarcely do that, for to abandon the principle of homogeneity of grouping in education would lead to the advocacy of randomness of grouping --- a class might have people from IQ 25 to 200, and from ages 5 to 20 if homogeneity of ability level is not significant for educability. If e.m.r.'s do not need homogeneous grouping, would the "cons" also abandon it for t.m.r.'s, the blind, the deaf, the physically gifted?

Thus, I must suggest that those who oppose special classes for e.m.r.'s are either doing so non-rationally or are opposing something else in its name. I urge you to consider these alternatives as you hear and/or read opponents of special classes for the educable mentally retarded. They object not to the special classes but to their failures, their mis-use, their labels and connotations and because of the objections to them from projected parental egoes substituting for concern about welfare of children. They should admit that the homogeneity of grouping of e.m.r.'s in many cases in these United States results in:

a) classes of 3 to 6 year age range

b) placement in sub-standard physical location

c) placement with sub-standard teachers

d) sub-standard materials and supplies for instruction

e) unknowledgable supervision

and f) grossly inadequate diagnostic data collection and continuity.

The critics might not object if every e.m.r. class were:

1. within a 12 month age span

2. in a standard or superior physical plant

3. supervised by competent personnel

4. composed of individuals admitted and assigned after educational, psychological, pediatric, and communications specialists had individually examined and collectively, with intake social worker, staffed them

5. budgeted for materials and supplies so that no teacher felt restricted in that regard

6. part of a system in which the board of education very simply said, "We want the world's best program --- we're willing to pay for it but don't intend to waste any money in the process."

7. part of a system where full-time job placement specialists were employed by the school system to aid in the transition of e.m.r.'s from school to job prior to any voc.-rehab. --- special education agreement even in the 1st such state --- Texas --- and follow-up studies of the graduates for the last ten years show 84% of them successfully adultated --- housewives, working, in trade school or armed services

8. where the most able e.m.r.'s are issued a diploma during their 18th or early 19th year of age and the less able ones during their 20th year

9. where Vocational Rehabilitation at the school's request pays for job training including trade school in cosmetology, nurses aid, body and fender and others

10. where 300-400 e.m.r.'s age 6 to 20, or 200 age 6-12 are housed in a single school building, and parents are formally demanding more segregated schools for the educable mentally retarded

11. where, in addition to home room teachers for groups of 10 to 20 pupils, full-time auxiliary staff in a single school of 400 e.m.r.'s includes

2 dually certified P.E.-M.R. teachers

1 dually certified Ind. Arts-M.R. teacher

1 dually certified Voc. Home Ec.-M.R. teacher

1 dually certified Driver E.-M.R. teacher

1 or more speech therapists as needed

1 language developmentalist

2 dually certified Administration-M.R. supervisors.

Again, I suggest that we work to remove the MR label from children whose potential is for blending imperceptably into the general adult population --- but I urge that children of about 1/2 to 3/4 normal ability to learn not be deprived of the advantages of homogeneous grouping in school, i.e., of special classes. To abandon special classes is to return to the era of the 1930's and 40's --- the era of social promotions and dropouts at the end of compulsory attendance of earlier --- to the era of no Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped in USOE --- to that era of no Title I or II or III or VI or 89-313 and no 1969 Voc. Ed. amendments. I urge that we work to improve special classes not abandon them simply because some are less than ideal --- and above all not abandon them for no constructive alternative.

Our special classes for e.m.r.'s pay off.

Visit us in the Special School District of St. Louis County, Missouri --- by appointment, please!

*Special Class Placement or How to Destroy in the Name of Help

By Tony C. Milazzo, Director
Urban Program in Education,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

One of the last times I was asked to speak on the subject of mental retardation, an interesting thing happened. I was asked to send a picture and material on myself prior to the meeting where I was going to give the speech. Time passed by after sending this picture and materials, and the date arrived for me to give the talk. I arrived in town in time to have a bite to eat and pick up a newspaper. As I drove to the meeting, I stopped at a stop light, and I thought this would be a good time to glance down at the front page of the newspaper. As I did, I saw a picture of myself and in large printing beneath it, it said RETARDED SPEAKER. That will give you a few clues. Those of you who moved in front may want to move back again!

You know, as I looked at this topic, and began to put some ideas down, I went back over some old papers. It suddenly occured to me that in 1963 I appeared on a similar panel, at a CEC convention from 10:30 to 12:00 on a Thursday instead of a Friday, and spoke on the subject of the efficacy of special classes for the educable mentally retarded. As I looked at the notes that I used, I was amazed at myself because in 1963 I took a very positive position in support of special classes for the retarded. As I looked over those notes, I was further amazed with the way I pulled notions and points out of left field and right field and all over the place, because that's what it took in order to make any kind of a defense. I was very dishonest with myself and ashamed of myself for that particular point. I was also impressed with myself being at that time so narrow and having such a narrow view of what society is about and what's happening today in education. Many things have happened since 1963. We were asked to move out of the horse and buggy age into the jet age. Some of us have tried to do it, either successfully or unsuccessfully; others haven't. I think at this point, the issue of the efficacy of special classes is a dead one. I don't even want to debate it. During those 7 years and all of the things that have happened, the efficacy of special classes is dead as far as I'm concerned.

What concerns me is it's incredible that in '70, many of us still refuse to recognize that it's dead. The reality is that unless we special educators recognize the death of this issue-we should give it a nice funeral, and then work toward an operational killing of special classes ourselves-then they are going to be killed for us, and many of us are going to be selling insurance or raising rabbits. Many writers today are saying that schools are destroying kids. To me, Hintoff summarizes the situation when he says, in one of the most exciting

*Transcribed from a tape of the presentation.

educational journals, The Evergreen Review, "What's the sentence for killing a child? I don't mean with a gun or a knife or with napalm. I mean the kind of killing that convinces a child he's stupid, that pushes him to drop out of school or insures that even if he's graduated from high school, his place in society is permanently at its bottom. The sentence for that kind of killing is tenure for teachers and administrators, testimonial dinners for retiring heads of school boards, and more research contracts for those social scientists to study again why those ghetto kids won't learn."

What many of these people are saying is that while we think we're teaching reading, writing, arithmetic, etc., we are also teaching other things. It's the fact that we haven't recognized it that concerns many of us. Because what we're doing in education is doing a very effective job of teaching game playing while it's hidden behind reading, writing, and arithmetic. A kid learns how to psych out the teacher, what kind of response is asked for, and learns to play the game. We do a great job of teaching kids that they're stupid, and that they act stupidly. We do a tremendous job of teaching many kids that they have no identity because they function with a language that's unacceptable and come from unacceptable families and environments. Education teaches dependence because they have no choices-kids don't-about what they want to learn; what the rules for learning and behaving are. We do a beautiful job-that adults know and are right-kids don't and they're wrong, and little or nothing is negotiable. Education does a beautiful job of teaching that there's really not any freedom, and therefore one need not develop any sense of responsibility about freedom. We do a beautiful job of teaching dishonesty. Was George Washington really such a great guy? Or was he human too? Were there really no blacks or Indians or even Sicilians who made any significant or positive contributions to the building of this nation? Should all families really be like Dick and Jane and Spot and all those cats? I could go on, but you know the other kinds of things that we're teaching in education.

I think that as we look at the social scene and as we look at the kinds of things that I just mentioned in education, I think we need to look at the national crisis, the social crisis of which we see many symptoms. There are underground newspapers, riots on 12th Street in Detroit, black caucuses - a variety of other symptoms that are telling us some things, and are responding to the kinds of teaching that education is doing, without recognizing it. And I think special education is really doing a great deal to continue to reinforce the kinds of issues that are going to continue our having to face a national social crisis.

Special education is supporting a notion that the problem is the kid, not the system, and saying that what we must do is remediate the child in order to meet the standards and requirements of the system. This is instead of looking at the system itself and asking how we might better accommodate the learning and behavior needs of kids. It's a nice arrangement for the system, the one we have, because it allows us to throw out the word accountability. It's the kids problem, and we don't have to worry about that. Clearly, special education and other

educational specialties have reinforced this kind of behavior. We've provided a process through which to channel non-accountable action, and then feel very proud of ourselves that we're helping. A child isn't making it in a particular class. The teacher can call on the school psychologist who carries his Binet kit and other bags of tricks to find a number or see a pattern of behavior so the kid can be assigned to a nice new label and can be removed from the class. If there is no special class or no room in the special class, the child gets to keep his nice new label anyway and the teacher feels better, because after all, she doesn't know how to teach the mentally retarded or the emotionally disturbed. If the kid does get assigned to a special class for the EMR, what happens to him? Oh, about 90 percent of the time, he stays there for the rest of his school days. The label tells him he's stupid, and the other kids tell him he's stupid, and sure enough, every 3 years when that guy comes around again, it's proved to be right, within eight Binet points.

Let's the look at the process in terms of some of the things that Rosenthal and Jacobson and others have been doing and saying about this kind of issue. You all know this, and Dunn, in his paper, responded to it. I won't go in to it. I just raise the question and encourage you to look at it, if you haven't. But some other things along that line, I think, are interesting to consider. Let's look at Head Start, and all of the great gains that are made. The kids move forward with great benefits, and then they hit the school. What happens? Everything goes down. We can look at other kinds of issues. Let's look at an example of a study that was done in the state of Indiana, where they took a set of psychological examinations-the reports of them-and removed the identifying data, and asked a variety of school psychologists to read the material and then, make a distinction as to what kinds of kids these were. In 90 percent of the cases, there were at least three labels that could come out of the same psychological report: MR, ED, and Autistic. Let's look at an experience in a University of Michigan Fresh Air Camp where for some 20 years, kids having severe learning or behavior problems have been coming to camp. Many years ago, the children were identified as delinquents; later they were called emotionally disturbed. When it became appropriate, they were called disadvantaged. Later they were called emotionally disturbed again. I mean the same kids. The same kids, year after year. I think it raises a question.
Does all of this mean that the problem is the kid? I think we'd better look at the system, both the regular and the special system.
We're also dealing with the issue of prevention versus remediation or compensatory education. Special education says that our goal is to get ourselves out of a job. But do we really mean that? Everything we do certainly reinforces the fact that we're going to always have a job. We wait until the kid has a severe learning or behavior problem, and then try to deal with it. In effect, we in special education spend our time bailing kids out of the stream, rather than going up to the head of the stream and saying, "Who's throwing them in?"

What's happening to teacher education? Well, the university operates in the same ways in terms of special education, except we deal a little differently with exceptionality in the universities. We don't let them get in. We don't have the problem of special classes there. Those students that do get in are encouraged to perpetuate the system-to teach game playing, do as I say, not as I do. We know the answer. We know what's best for you. I think another problem is the whole sense of the power shift that has to occur. Schools and universitites are now operating special and regular education in isolation. When we begin to look at the whole notion of involvement, which means a shift of power, it means that the schools and the universities have to give up a good bit of power. This is scary to schools, and it's scary to universities. It presents a dilemma when we really begin to talk about meaninful community involvement. We need to look at the whole question of the role of the teacher, who now is a stuffer of knowledge, whether it's in special or regular education. Teachers need to move to a role of greater responsibility in terms of being a resource person and a facilitator of learning and a creator of a learning environment.

Many writers that I mentioned earlier, who have been I think, rightfully and rather viciously attacking the establishment of schooling, have also been attacked themselves. One area of attack and the point of attack has been that they are attacking but are not presenting alternatives. I'd like to throw out, just very briefly, a few notions in terms of an alternative. First of all there would be no special education classes. We would be able to have the kind of an environment where children learn, based on life experiences and self-motivation. One of our greatest sources of failures in schools is forced learning of materials and facts of little or no interest to the learner. Children, like adults, find greater joy and excitement in those things which are familiar and related to their environment. Skills and concepts, for example, could be more easily taught to urban children, as well as all children, if the materials used represent life experiences coming from their own backgrounds or own area, with community involvement. The difficulty and importance attached to learning is indeed too complex to add the dimension of unrelated and insignificant useless facts.

Secondly, schools should be placed where kids will make choices which influence their own learning and behavior. It's essential that students have experiences with choice-making so as to become autonomous and self-directed. Children must develop the habit of approaching curriculum, attending to it, and learning from it with and through their own initiative. We need to create schools where children will be provided with meaninful person-to-person interaction within the classroom so that they can become resources to each other. One of the goals has to be to develop shared relationships. When children are

permitted to learn from each other, a variety of developments occur. The helping student becomes more enthusiastic about and successful in his own learning, and voluntarily seeks additional information to share. The learner feels less threatened receiving help from friends and tend to make greater efforts to learn. Children who engage in helping activities tend to become more efficient in the communications skills and in developing genuine concern for others. In fact, teachers can learn a whole lot by seeing kids teach others kids. The role of helping other students should be engaged in on a voluntary basis.

Another point that's critical is that children will not be separated according to competencies. The issue of homogeniety is also a dead one. Grouping according to competence prevents shared learning. It stigmatizes children who fall below the so-called accelerated level. As a result feelings of inadequacy are derived by those who do not make the top group, and the drive to compete for acceptance by the top group creates emotional stress, hositility, and aggressiveness. School should be a place where children will be a part of the classroom learning environment, which will foster self-esteem, recognition, dignity, and approval. All children should be accepted on an equal basis with every other child. The classroom environment must denote individual concern for the feelings, needs, and abilities of every child without his having to compete for such concerns. Schools should be places where children share in the process of assessing their own emotional and academic growth. The grading system needs to be thrown out. It's unnecessary and destroys kids. Children should be allowed to assess their own achievement and intellect. Testing should be thrown out. It adds little to look at the whole notion of norms, particularly national norms. Schools should be places where children use self-discipline without punishment. Punishment doesn't help children to assess and alter their behavior except temporarily or out of fear. Fear as opposed to self-control causes submission to dominance and perpetuates the authoritarian model that denies the basic human right of the individual. Punishment fosters physical aggression rather than verbal articulation. In an atmosphere of submission, fear, and aggression, learning is impeded. Schools should be places where children will work in an environment where the role of the teacher is that of a resource person and a facilitator of learning, rather than a stuffer of knowledge.

I see these just as some ideas. There are places where things are beginning to happen, schools where they are trying out some notions. There are other kinds of characteristics of training programs that are, I think, beginning to move. Let me just summarize. One, we're talking about eliminating the whole business of separation of so-called special and general education. Two, we're talking about a re-focus on the fact that the problem is the system, not the kid. Three, we're talking about eliminating the labeling of kids which results in a poor self-concept. Four, we

would be better utilizing all the resources we have by eliminating special education. Finally, the role of the special educator would really increase if we eliminated special education. I think the special educator who is skillful could move to a much more prominent role as a consultant and try to be a translator of the kinds of things we've learned by identifying and labeling kids; he could work with kids who have major learning and behavior needs and problems and translate this into the mainstream to assist for all children in the classes.

*The Efficacy of Special Class Placement for Educable Mental Retardates

By Roger Reger, Director
Special Education
Board of Cooperative Educational Services
Buffalo, New York

No other issue in the field of special education today so dramatically sets apart those who might classify themselves as idealists from those who might call themselves practical men as the issue that we're talking about today. The basic question for the practical man is not whether special classes are effective. The question really is whether children currently attending classes will continue doing so, or whether they will be excluded from school because they no longer have a place to go.

For the idealist who usually seems to be hidden away in a university tower, there's research and so-called research. I use that phrase so-called research several times to refer to what people call research which in my opinion really isn't. It isn't legitimate. It doesn't prove anything. This so-called research shows that few if any differences justify the creation and maintenance of special classes for children who are handicapped. For this idealist, there is seldom any reference to alternatives to special class placement beyond rather naively implying that the elimination of special classes would force the handicapped children into regular classes.

I'm against placing children into special classes. I'm against classifying any child as mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, brain-injured, deaf, or any number of labels that place him into a category that's irrelevant to educational conditions. On the other hand, I'm in favor of including every child into a public school program if that child and his parents so desire. But I do not believe that I can put on my blindfold, take away the special class, and then place the educable retarded student or any other handicapped student into a regular class and assume that the world has now balanced itself.

Although the position that I'm taking, at least by the title of this paper, classifies me with the idealists, I must admit that my idealism is related more to the broad picture of educational programming than to the specific issue of the value or effectiveness of special classes. And my idealism relates to the future and not to the present.

I think we first have to look at how we come to classify a child as "handicapped." Many of us are still under the assumption that a child becomes emotionally disturbed only after a psychiatrist and/or psychologist says he's emotionally disturbed.

*Transcribed from a tape of the presentation

We think that a child becomes mentally retarded only after a psychologist has administered a Wechsler or a Binet scale and says he's mentally retarded. But the fact of the matter, as I see it, is that a child becomes handicapped as soon as he cannot meet the demands of the surrounding environment. This definition really is, as far as I'm concerned, the definition of "handicapped."

The labels that are applied are only administrative, legal, or at best humanitarian afterthoughts that justify the discriminatory action we've taken against the child who can't function in the society we have created for him. Keeping for a moment on the same path, let's reflect on what has happened during the past few years.

We began many years ago with relatively few categories for sorting children with problems. We had the mentally retarded. We had words like idiot, moron, imbecile. Some people still use these terms. We had the blind, the deaf, the orthopedically disabled. We then added new categories and refined the old ones. This process started a few years back and we are still doing it. We had the juvenile delinquent, the emotionally disturbed, and then we suddenly had the hard-of-hearing and the partially sighted, and now we have the culturally disadvantaged, the brain-injured, and even now we're starting to have categories like learning disability which are being further defined into perceptual handicaps, dyslexia, and dysgraphia.

Where do all these new categories come from? Is it really true that so-called medical advances produce children today that did not survive several years ago? Or is it possible that we have such refined tests now that we simply happen to find these tests falling on kids who happen to be members of these new categories? Or are we now blessed with such sophisticated diagnosticians that children who have been with us all along have been unnoticed by their teachers and parents but have been picked out by the skilled eye of the new diagnostician? No, I don't think that we can say that our new categories for classifying handicapped children are due to medical advances, sharper diagnosticians, or better testing procedures. Paradoxically, the new proliferation of categories is due to the increasing sophistication of our school system. Several years ago, the demands in our schools probably were much less than they are today. We did not have boards of education telling us to write objectives and describe ways of meeting these objectives. Our teachers colleges were staffed by what were characterized as little old ladies who read children's books to the classes of budding teachers. In the classrooms, children did not have ITPA, triple AS science, or the spectra of Russian space missiles outdoing us in the competition for world superiority. Children haven't changed. Today the expectations placed on children in our schools have greatly increased. Unfortunately the children have not changed to meet these expectations, and so increasing numbers are falling by the wayside. Special education has accomodatingly run along side the conveyor belt to pick up these children who have fallen off.

To a large extent, the word handicap or disability is synonomous with failure. Let's examine this. The new role for special education has become painted with the charge that it serves as a preventive agent for change in the curriculum of the school. To a certain extent, special education is a curriculum deodorizer. As the schools have become more rigid and less responsive to individual differences, no challenge is issued because as children demonstrate their inability to respond to the increased pressures, they become the failures rather than the schools. As a child fails, the school has a system and rushes to exonerate itself of the blame. The teacher immediately and anxiously questions whether it is he or the child who is at fault. And this teacher, understandably, is not prepared to assume that he is responsible for the actions of the entire system that has locked him in.

The second step in the exoneration process takes place when the principal is called upon by the teacher to help rationalize the school's failure with the child. The principal as an administrator usually calls upon the school psychologist. On the surface the principal is saying to the psychologist that he has a child with a problem and wants to understand the child better. The principal asks the psychologist to come to the school and talk with the child and his teacher, administer some tests, and then help the staff to better understand why the child isn't progressing. However, what the principal as an agent of the school system is really saying is, "We have a child here who has failed, and we have decided that it is not our fault. We want you to come in and sanction the actions of the school by saying that this child has in fact failed. However, because you are a psychologist, you are also a humanitarian, because we basically are not cruel. We do not want to blame the child for failing. Therefore your job, the job the school pays you for, is to come to our school and tell us that this failing child is handicapped. Because the child is classified as handicapped, he is not responsible for his actions, and it is not his fault that he is unable to read. He is not at fault because he is mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed or brain-injured. He did not want to be or ask to be a behavior problem or unmotivated to learn. He is the way he is because he's handicapped." Now that the child has been labeled as handicapped, the school takes the next logical step and places the child in a situation where he no longer constitutes a threat. The school wants to continue operating as it always has, but by law and by sentiment, it recognizes that it must provide something for the so-called handicapped child, and so offers a special class.

The special class is an appendage to the body of the school. The students in the special class must integrate into the body of the school, and sympathizers must frequently fight for this integration. No other child in school has to integrate. Frequently this child is not even allowed to attend his own school, but is placed in an institution, a day school, or is given home teaching. The alternative being considered here is the special class, but the other actions I put in the same category.

Incidentally, the fact that a child is classified as "educable mentally retarded" is seen as an administrative fiction differing little from other classifications that could be used. Dunn's argument in the September '68 issue of Exceptional Children seems to be one of who's got the real IQ. I thought his argument related more to misclassification of kids rather than to arguing about whether retarded kids should be in special classes. The gist of the paper here so far is that if the schools demanded less of students or if more variation were allowed, then we wouldn't need special classes, but that's not enough. I want to emphasize that I'm not saying, after reading some research reports and the so-called research reports, that the logical conclusion presents itself that special classes should be eliminated. The fact that we are solving a problem, that is failure, in a certain way at this time suggests more that we have to look at the problem, rather than at the solutions we've used, as sources of answers.

Special education is a field that has been plagued for years with answers. For example, a typical answer frequently is this: "This child really has problems so he belongs in a special class." This statement of the answer is typical in our field. "This child is emotionally disturbed. He belongs in an institution." As I see the picture on the national scene there will be two significant events influencing the existence or nonexistence of special classes. (One noninfluence will be research, because I think decisions will be made and research will be called in afterwards to justify whatever happens.)

The first phenomenon that will take place, and Lloyd Dunn mentioned this too, is the action through the courts. Far too often, special classes or any other special program are recognized not as havens for the handicapped but as disposal units for problems. Special education is being seen by many now as a form of racial or aristocratic discrimination. In a few cases where there are disproportionate numbers of minority group children classified as handicapped and placed in special classes, it has become obvious, and court suits have been placed. I think that this type of action will spill over into places where discrimination is for reasons other than race. Why should a child who is blind have to attend a special residential school when it isn't necessary? Why should a so-called emotionally disturbed child be removed from the school when nobody can really rationalize that kind of diagnosis, and when many other similar kinds of children are not removed from school? There is an uneveness in the disposition of problem children.

The second form of action will be in the creation of individualized instruction programs. This approach is desirable but extremely difficult. Individualized instruction is one of the most misused terms in the educational dictionary. The term is confused with individual attention, it is used as a political clarion call, and it is used by hardware salesmen claiming that machine programs are equivalent to or synonomous with individualized instruction. And the term is used, perhaps worst of all, to justify the existence of special education programs.

To dwell a moment on the last point, consider that a heterogenous, completely dissimilar group of children, are placed together with only IQ scores between 50 and 75 as a common denominator. A teacher or program director may claim that because of this supposedly common factor the group is therefore homogenous, and therefore the logical implication is that individualized instructional programming is being offered. The only time that assumption can possibly hold is when one assumes that there is only one child in the room and he fills 15 seats. And even then, that assumption implies individual attention rather than individual instruction. Our society is not ready to establish programs that offer individualized instruction. Far more flexibility will be necessary than we currently allow in our schools. Today we can't even have so-called ungraded schools without creating a clamor or creating, on the other hand, a charade of terms that keeps us from really doing or seeing what we're doing in ungraded schools, which is really a very small step toward individualized instruction.

When we arrive at the day when we do have individualized instruction, we will not have school buildings as we know them today. We will not have the typical authoritarian hierarchical system which we have today, with the superintendent, principal, and director. We will have gotten away from the idea that our task is to do more of what we are doing today: to build the same kinds of schools, only with better materials and cheaper methods, to teach reading with improved basal readers or code breaking tests, to have teachers with doctorates instead of masters degrees, and to have principals with 400 hours of administrative courses rather than 4 or 40. Let's get rid of special classes by providing individual programs for all students that are not based on program molds into which each child must fit by gross diagnoses or classifications. Let's forget about sorting students that way and recognize that children can be diagnosed into 100 categories which change each hour according to the program or other environmental artifacts. If a child does only what he can do, he won't fail. If he doesn't fail, he won't be handicapped.

Mental Retardation 1984: Will the Paradox End?

Donald F. Sellin, Ed.D.
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

The Paradox is Alive and Well

Let it be said regretfully, but validly, that special education personnel can find little comfort in the research literature to justify special programs for the mentally retarded. The paradox described by Johnson (1962) is very much alive and well. The thunderbolts hurled by Dunn (1968) contain powerful arguments against special education as a legitimate, respectable, and even ethical educational enterprise. The observations advanced by Blatt (1960) now seem mild by comparison.

Even the most superficial review of the reviews of the literature comparing special class vs regular grade placement cannot be rationalized into justification for special education. Two relatively recent reviews produced by Spicker and Bartel (1968) as well as by Prehm and Crosson (1969) are similar in expressing the disappointment that, with the exception of the Peck and Sexton (1961) report, there is no objective evidence to forthrightly verify social, emotional, or academic differences for special class graduates.

The Fiscal appropriations for mental retardation services on local, state, and federal levels have risen over the past decade. Organizations such as the N.A.R.C., P.C.M.R., A.A.M.D., and C.E.C. continue to press for increases in such services, particularly educationally oriented ones, in the name of providing equal educational opportunities. It would seem apparent that if programs are to continue in the name of equal opportunity, decision-makers will require results which support special education as a legitimate alternative to regular class placement.

Why is the Paradox Alive and Well?

Dunn (1968) has identified factors which have contributed to our present state of affairs as did Johnson (1962). The present writer feels factors are persisting obstacles in the valid operation of special programs for the retarded. These groupings and their effects are identified as follows:

Administrative Factors:

Dunn (1968) notes that special education has tended to operate at the mercy of general education priorities and concerns. The thesis is that special education has lacked sufficient autonomy to regulate, operate, and evaluate its inputs and outputs. The basement rooms, the converted church basement, the terminal elementary program with no provision for senior high schools are examples of this dynamic.

Placement has been a critical administrative problem. Lack of differential diagnosis in favor of the single I.Q. as the sole criterion for placement has been widespread. One has only to observe special classes for the retarded to note that some classes are serving as an absolution for responsibility to programs for the disturbed, the perceptually handicapped, the multi-handicapped, and the children of poverty. In this process, the population for whom these classes were intended have obviously suffered.

Information Gaps and Breakdowns:

Information is still a criterical problem. Theories and fads complete with conflicting and contradictory voices. In the absence of an unified theory concerning special education, there has been a randomization of selection of goals, methods, materials, and evaluation procedures. We seem to richochet from the unit plan to programmed instruction to psycholinguistics to perceptual training to behavioral modification to perscriptive teaching and so on and on and on.

Associated with this problem of securing information has been, until recently; the

problem of dispensing it in relatively efficient forms. The traditional mode of universities and colleges has been wielded into informational systems sponsored by state and principally federal agencies. The establishment of the I.M.C., and R and D centers, as well as the M.R. Interdisciplinary Institutes are magnificent examples of future promise.

Information has significance for service planning, development, and delivery. Administration of special education programs is ideally interdependent and contingent upon the actions of other social institutions. In addition to inter-agency information needs, there are hard decisions for intra-agency policies. Allocations of funds and personnel should be based upon reasonable inferences.

Teachers and Their Preparation:

Johnson (1962) identified teachers and their expectations of children as a prime factor for the paradox. His remarks seemed to lack the clarity of Cain and Levine (1961) who seemed willing to conceed that the sins of teachers (real or imagined) are the responsibility of universities and colleges which recruit, select, prepare, and approve these personnel.

What is at issue is the lack of a definition of Professionalism which transcends 100 percent membership in a particular organization. It is believed by the present writer that commitment to a definition of professionalism would be rallying points for united effort among professors, administrators, practitioners, and concerned citizens. The guidelines suggested by Stevens (1970) seem clear and reasonable. It is regretable that these notions have not gained wider acceptance. Among these elements would be the following:

1. an orderly body of knowledge
2. specialized terminology
3. logical system of inquiry
4. formal period of preparation
5. standards of practice
6. recognized society of colleges
7. privilege communication

8. certificates to practice
9. define unique elements of service
10. code of ethics
11. willingness to share and produce knowledge
12. willingness to extend the quality of practice by supervision of prospective practitioners.

What Can Be Done?

General:

It is recommended by the present writer that special education for the mentally retarded should be continued. This recommendation is based upon the assumption that we possess sufficient knowledge to design educational programs for those learners which would represent a legitimate alternative to regular classes. This recommendation is advanced from a reasonably objective frame of references with minimal elements of a vested interest. Also, assumed is that these recommendations which follow will be acted upon.

Administrative:

In order to overcome previously cited difficulties in administration the following proposals are advanced:

1. Establishment of Independent Special Education School Districts

Special education programs should be administered on the St. Louis model. The notion of special education a part of rather than apart from may have been well intentioned, but the effects of this notion has created an unwholesome subservience to general education. Another advantage of this recommendation would be that related elements of administration such as fiscal allotments, in-service training, diagnostics, placement, and program evaluation could be under professional direction and control. For those who might take exception to a unique administrative status for special education, let us all be reminded of the advent of a Title VI and the administrative reorganization of H.E.W. which was asso-

ciated with it. These events seemed to demonstrate certain values for assigning specifity of administrative, responsibility and autonomy.

2. Delivery of Services Model

Education of retarded children should adopt concepts of planning and development associated with Comprehensive Health Planning and the Comprehensive Vocational Rehabilitation efforts. Central to these efforts are major themes as follows:

a. definition of the characteristics of populations to be served.
b. definition of the adequacy of current provisions for service.
c. definition of obstacles to providing services.
d. definition of a required continuim and comprehensiveness of service.
e. definition of required resources and/or modification of existing resources.
f. definition of a schedule for the installation of services.
g. definition of a system for the evaluation of quality of services.

3. Program Planning

Given that administration is not easy, there should be methods to conserve the administrators time and effort. Additionally, there should be methods to enable the administrator to make decisions according to rational considerations. The utility of a program planning and budgeting is that decision-making is based upon allocations of resources to specific system objectives.

This system (as carried out along major program, component program, and sub program guidelines) would be an aid to evaluation of services. Duplication of other services could be noted readily. Factual data could be assembled for examinations of the extent to which declared objectives were being achieved.

4. The Team Is Alive and Well

Given freedom of administrative action and given freedom for unnecessary administrative detail, the promise of indisciplinary teams could be realized. The major implications would be, at first, improved diannostic services. This improvement would be followed by improved health and social services to pupils and their families.

5. F.P.I.R. Is Coming

The culmination of administrative reforms will be the establishment of regional Fixed Points of Information and Referral. This would mean a 24 hour telephone answering service available to citizens and professionals. As referrals cannot be made because of absence or inadequacies in services, an objective base for needed services to be maintained and reviewed. With parental consent, computerized case studies could be maintained for inter agency referrals and services delivery.

Information and Its Transmission.

The problem is probably not having enough, but of having relevant information readily available and accessible. These are some suggestions advanced by the present writer as follows:

6. Taxonomy as the Tools

Taxonomy as per Bloom (1956) and Stevens (1962) is an attempt to order information according to a reasonable order which allows for the identification of new data into a rational context. The seemingly apparent superiority of natural sciences is probably explained by a precise ordering of knowledge along rational schemes. The further advantage of taxonomy, especially the Stevens (1962) model, is that this process is neutral with respect to theoretical competition. Its most practical application to computerization. A function application to program assessment has been described by Harvey et al (1966).

7. The Kindly Computer

At present, computers are understood as sources of information regarding educational media. There have been examples of the computer to assist the individual pupil. Without citing specifics, it would seem reasonable to speculate that computer systems could be developed to assist teachers. For example, it would not seem too far fetched to imagine that teachers could consult a computer for instant advice on the selection and availability

of materials, methods, or techniques.

8. Would You Believe the Case History?

The place of the clinically oriented case history in research journals should be given greater priority. This recommendation is not meant to quarrel with the traditional, large sample, statistically ground research design. However, Dunn's (1963) generalization that traditional research results have applicability to groups rather than to individuals suggests a place of reports such as the original report of Itard which launched this profession in the first place. Given the great emphasis upon perscriptive teaching, it would be helpful to have action reports from classroom teachers citing their experiences.

Teachers

Teachers will be the key to it all. The future of special education is in their committment. A few suggestions offered from a sympathetic perscriptive are as follows:

9. The Magic of Mager

Mager (1962) has delightfully summarized operational criteria for the statement of educational objectives. The most admirable aspect of Mager is the explicit relationship between intent and evaluation. Application of Mager to perscriptive teaching is obvious. The format of case history reports should, in part, include the objective(s) of behavioral change, and description of treatment, and an evaluation of associated outcomes.

10. Ginott and Berne Will Lead the Way

Berne (1964) and his Games (good ones and bad ones) should prove an useful, self appraisal device for teachers. The concept of transactional analysis can serve as an assessment of parent-teacher relationships, especially in the areas of sensitive communications. Game-psychology can be useful in assessing motivation for selecting teaching as a vocational and in analyzing one's satisfaction with it.

To know Ginott (1969) is to define ways of conversation with children. Acceptance of

Ginott is to enter into conversation which avoid self defeat for both adult and child. It is a "new" way of praise and criticism to build internalized self direction and controls. It is a way of changing adult-child relationships away from the well-intentioned mistakes of yesteryear to helpful (in the Ginott sense) relationship for future growth.

11. The Educational Sense

While technology will be increasingly evident in the classroom, technology itself, will not be a sufficient answer. Consequently, instead of funds for one teacher and 15 pupils; we may observe the appropriations of X dollars for a specific set of programs objectives to be accomplished for X pupils. It really seems hardly daring to suggest concepts of team teaching although it does seem necessary to continue to press for it. The education of pupils in groups for eventual group membership should continue but supplemented by technology.

The segregated school of the past will become a special school for special purposes. In such settings, teachers will be free to develop refinement and competence in relatively narrow areas.

The question of para-professionals will be firmly resolved. These personnel will function as an extension of professionally directed skills and as a relief from routine non-instructional duties.

Probably the most important development to standardize instruction will be the preparation of I. V. films for retarded children. These productions could have the effect of releasing teacher energies for refinement and enrichment of learning.

12. Professionalism Will Be A Household Word

As mentioned earlier, professionalism will be defined by standards described by Stevens (1970). It will be necessary for teachers to define standards for preparation, professional services, professional teaching conditions as well as standards for continuing

certification. The problem of past research comparing special vs. regular classes has been the assumption that there was something unique about the special. This hasn't been so. A definition of the standards of professional practice determined by the practicing professionals themselves would contribute to resolving this lack of uniqueness. It is doubtful that legislaturers will listen to administrators and professors with the same enthusiasm as they would to classroom practitioners.

Changing Populations and Responsive Curriculum Design

14. Populations To Be Served

The multi-handicapped will increasingly be among us. This will include the effects of orthopedic, sensory, and linguistic impairments.

The most notable improvement in special education will be a severe definition of mental retardation for service delivery. Hopefully, there will be the application of intervention techniques to offset the cerebral effects of poverty. Both events should have the effect of wiping out functional mental retardation as a service population. Improved diagnostic techniques will require general education to honor its obligations to these children handicapped by emotional disability and disrupted environments. nSpecial education will have creative energies to devote to the problems of the multi-handicapped as well as to the refinement of vocational preparation for the moderately retarded.

15. A Responsive Curriculum

Mental retardation will be more flexibly defined within its service boundaries. The continuim from profound through mild will be based upon actual demonstrated capacity than upon I. Q. catagories. Public schools will define and operate programs for at least the severely retarded assuming there has been no breakthroughs for the profound. Programs will be based upon objectives rather than measured intelligence. Once a child is enrolled,

he can ultimately rise to whatever level his own initiative and teacher effort can perform.

Smith (1968) has advanced the basis of a curriculum which allows a teacher to respond to the range of abilities in retarded children. This curriculum, if more widely adopted, would enable the concepts of clinical teaching to be implemented according to developmental levels of retarded learners. Elements of this curriculum might be said to include:

a. perceptual-motor development including mechanicisms of input, association, output and feedback necessary for intellectual development.

b. communication skills including spoken, written, and gestural language systems necessary for intellectual development.

c. reading skills including functional literacy

d. arithmetic skills including functional applications

e. interpersonal relationships including the traditional values of the social studies and sciences, as well as the skills necessary for social and vocational adjustment.

f. adult education as an element of public school progressing to provide "Helpful" guidance to the adult retardate.

g. Parent education would also be a major program. The focus would be upon helping and receiving help from the parents of retarded children. Furthermore, under this program would be a component of educating persons to be effective parents.

Summary

If the present writer has achieved any degree of communication the following points have been developed:

1. The paradox described by Johnson (1962) and elaborated by Dunn (1968) is

alive and well.

2. The paradox lives because of factors inherent in:

   a. the administration of special education programs which allows general education concerns to dictate to special education.

   b. gaps in our information, conflicting theoretical systems, and possible inadequacies in translating information to the practitioners, and

   c. teachers have not developed a concept of professionalism which allows them to define standards of professional service.

3. The paradox can be ended and special education for the retarded can be a legitimate alternative for these pupils if action is taken.

4. Administratively, the following recommendations were advanced:

   a. the St. Louis Special School District as the autonomous model for operation.

   b. a delivery of services model for service planning and development.

   c. program planning as the model for program installation and evaluation.

   d. the inter-disciplinary team is alive and well.

   e. fixed points of information and referral will be realities for documenting needs for service development.

5. The implications of informational problems were seen as involving:

   a. taxonomy as a neutral device to store and retrieve information.

   b. the computer will assist teachers as they search for known remediation techniques for children.

   c. the case history will become a respectable form of inquiry.

6. With respect to teachers the following recommendations were offered:

   a. teachers will become psychologically comfortable with stating and

evaluating their intentions in behavioral terms.

b. teachers will adopt transactional analysis and new ways of praise and criticism as aids in their conversations with learners.

c. the educational setting of practice will utilize team teaching in special schools for special purposes. These teachers will become instructional specialists and among their specialities will be working with para-professionals.

d. professionalism will be an honorable concept. Teachers will declare their standards of service, preparation, and instruction.

7. With respect to curricular aspects, the following notions were advanced:

a. the multi-handicapped will be increasingly present.

b. the functionally retarded will either, be rightfully accomodated by general education, or eliminated by the impact of interventionist techniques.

c. mental retardation will be defined by levels of ability rather than I.Q. categories.

d. all levels of retardation will be accomodated by the public schools.

e. curriculum design will follow a program design ranging from early childhood through adulthood. Programs will range from "basic"perceptual development through literacy skills and culminate in vocational and social preparation.

If the present writer has really communicated, there will be a resolve for action. Hopefully, the recommendations advanced in this paper will serve as helpful guidelines.

Bibliography

Berne, E. Games People Play. New York: Grove Press, 1964.

Blatt, B. "Some persistently recurring assumptions concerning the mentally subnormal." The Training School Bulletin. 1960, 57, pp. 48-59.

Bloom, B., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: David McKay, 1956.

Cain, L., and Levine, S. A Study of the Effects of Community and Institutional School Classes for Trainable Mentally Retarded Children. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Program, Project No. 589. San Francisco: San Francisco State College, June 1961.

Dunn, L. Exceptional Children in the Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Dunn, L. "Special Education for the mildly retarded -- is much of it justifiable?" Exceptional Children. 1968, 35, pp. 5-22.

Ginott, H. Between Parents and Child. New York: Avon Books, 1965.

Harvey, A., Yep, B., and Sellin, D. "Developmental achievement of trainable mentally retarded children." The Training School Bulletin. 1966 Vol. 63, pp. 100-108.

Johnson, G.O. "Special Education for the mentally handicapped -- a paradox." Exceptional Children, 1962. Vol. 19, pp. 62-67.

Mager, R. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto: Fearson Publishers, 1962.

Peck, J., and Sexton, C.L. "Effect of various settings on trainable children's progress." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1961, Vol. 66, pp. 62-68.

Preim and Crosson, J. "The Mentally Retarded." Review of Educational Research. American Educational Research Association: Washington, D.C., 1969

Smith, R. Clinical Teaching: Methods of Instruction for the Retarded. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Spicker, H., and Bartel, N. "The Mentally Retarded" Exceptional Children Research Review. (Johnson and Blank, Editors) Washington, D.C.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1968.

Stevens, G.D., "Remarks Delivered to the 1970 Michigan Federation of the Council for Exceptional Children. Grand Rapids, Michigan, March, 1970."

Stevens, G. Taxonomy in Special Education for Children with Body Disorders. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1962.